

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Assessment of Student Learning Minutes  
(Inactive)

Assessment of Student Learning Committee  
(Inactive)

---

9-6-2016

### Assessment of Student Learning minutes 09/06/2016

Assessment of Student Learning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Assessment of Student Learning Committee, "Assessment of Student Learning minutes 09/06/2016" (2016). *Assessment of Student Learning Minutes (Inactive)*. 14.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn/14](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn/14)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee (Inactive) at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Assessment of Student Learning Minutes (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

UMM Assessment of Student Learning Committee  
Board Meeting Minutes: September 6, 2016  
1:00pm – 2:00pm Prairie Lounge

Committee Member

Present: Rebecca Dean, Kristin Lamberty, Nancy Helsper, Melissa Bert, Tricia Rohloff, Rachel Jonson, James Wojaszek, Tammy Berberi, Rachel Brockamp

Absent: 1<sup>st</sup> year Student

Other present: Makiko K Legate (supporting staff)

Proceedings:

Meeting called to order at 1:00pm by chair, Rebecca Dean  
No meeting minutes were submitted for amendment/approval

Business

1. Introduction of Committee members
  - a. Melissa Bert - Job description has not been written into committee language
  - b. Nancy Helsper, Institutional research coordinator of assessment learning
  - c. James Wojaszek – Spanish
  - d. Tammy Berberi - French : New on this assessment committee
  - e. Rachel Johnson - Science & Math
  - f. KK Lamberty - Computer Science
  - g. Steve Burks - Economics and Management
  - h. Rachel Brocamp - SDSA Rep: New on this assessment committee
  - i. Rebecca Dean - Anthropoloty : Sabbatical last year
2. Review of HLC demand
  - a. This meeting is mostly figuring out what we are doing this year and what happened last year
  - b. Brief report was given by Bart at the campus assembly at the end of last year
  - c. Main point of this response letter – the committee need to show the evidence of “closing the loop”.
  - d. Lack of participation – Need everyone on board, getting assessment done and closing the loop. Tie back the assessment data to changes in the curriculum
  - e. Next HLC report is due on March, 2018 and should indicate:
    - i. All campus programs have develop learning outcome procedures that align with campus standards.
    - ii. Assessment data from our programs are being recorded and analyzed systematically.
    - iii. The Analysis of the assessment data is being employed for the purposes of program improvement
  - f. Be able to accomplish #1, however, the argument is whether we have campus wide standards
  - g. #2 & #3 may take some work
  - h. HLC comes back for accreditation visit in Sprint 2020. It is important to accomplish this coming up report.
  - i. Have other campus written anything about overcoming these issues?
    - i. Template can be used

- ii. Twin Cities – uses assessment software, all online with full time coordinator to collect data ( success rate – unknown)
- iii. May be start a Google Classroom for the whole campus:
  - Set each assignment as a group assignment
  - Set the deadline in the Google calendar
  - Awareness of assignments, a place to do it, and the timeline (this was a complaint last year)
- iv. Real question: is there actual standard that you are asked to meet? This question is one we have not dealt with.
- v. Is everyone more or less doing the same level of assessment – Steve and Rachel looked at the reports and they were all varied in what they were doing
- vi. Simpler might not yield anything useful evidence
- vii. Bottom line – How have you used assessment and improved your program
  - Economic Discipline had multiple meetings and revised their SLOs, and determined what is a discipline plan vs “National” standard
  - Mapping may not be irrelevant?
- viii. Back to Workshop – People to get things done and help them figure out what they need to do at the same level
- ix. Again, this is related to accreditation – Important that actual work needs to be done, not just check off the list.

### 3. MN VALUE Project

- a. Minnesota schools are trying to do some assessment as a community. Schools are given a series of rubrics related to specific skills, knowledge and technology and these schools are collection sample of student work and applying these works on a community wide basis and looking at things such as : written communication
  - i. How students are changing on their written communication skills over their careers
  - ii. Adding some level of value to students and programs
  - iii. Verify the rubrics – how we are evaluating
- b. In 2014-15, we have collected work for written communication, quantitative literacy and critical thinking. 2015-16, we did same three rubrics.
  - i. Not useful result from 1<sup>st</sup> year
  - ii. No result from 2015-16 yet
- c. 2016-17, three more rubric would be added – intercultural knowledge and competence, civic engagement and ethical reasoning
- d. Has been mapped in to SLOs
- e. Eventually, by Spring 2020, we need to look at how we are evaluating Gen Eds – either connect with MN Value or direct assessment (was conducted in 2005 or 2008).
- f. Workshop may be helpful – people to understand what and why we are doing what we do.

### 4. For action

- a. In Gen Eds, how to measure if the students are actually learning what they are supposed to?
- b. Are we improving – programs and student learning?
- c. Originally, reevaluation of Gen Ed program was done through an exploratory committee as opposed to assessments
- d. A White Paper was proposed but not presented
- e. Curriculum committee has been looking at the Gen Eds – As Assessment committee, need to communicate/ report to curriculum committee
- f. Update the schedule (2016-17)

- i. Who has done the mapping so SLOs
    - ii. Doing Cooperative Institute Research program this year
    - iii. Leave off study abroad learning assessment.
  - g. Need to close the loop – if you evaluated your PSLO at some point, communicate with committee if it worked.
  - h. How are we transforming the data to improve the program and outcome?
  - i. Designate day to do all the reporting
    - i. Some resistance from faculty – not willing to give up a day out of their schedule
    - ii. Workshop to launch the day and go off to do it
  - j. Faculty development day
    - i. Do assessment in the morning and reports in the afternoon
    - ii. Concern – Can we do it annually (continuity)
    - iii. We can ask one designated person per discipline if it is more feasible
    - iv. Dean would like to have the list of “dysfunctional disciplines” - Communicate with chairs, work with them, and get them up to speed
  - k. Do we need another form of assessment besides MN Value Project?
    - i. Suggestion – 5 question multiple choice provided by disciplines to intro and senior courses
- 5. Next Meeting
  - a. Discuss subcommittee to undertake the task
  - b. Start thinking about how we are assessing the Gen Ed programs
  - c. New Gen Ed language program

Meeting adjourned at 2:00pm